



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Babylonian tradition influenced the various Orphic doctrines of the world-egg and its division into male and female parts, which in turn suggested the cutting apart of the double men in the *Symposium* (pp. 560 ff.). So the double men of Aristophanes are microcosmoi (p. 566); as the world is divided, so are they.¹

Thus Professor Ziegler distinguishes two influences exercised upon the *Symposium* myth, that of Empedocles and that of the Orphics, and in order to explain how this came about he postulates the existence of the Empedoclean-Orphic Anonymus mentioned above, who combined features of both systems and was Plato's immediate source. Aristophanes, who twice in his extant plays satirizes Orphism, would more properly be represented as jesting at the Orphics than at Empedocles (p. 570). This of course is only a conjecture, and an argument might be made against its necessity; granting that the material Plato uses is not original but even very old, must we assume that Plato was not capable of himself mingling in one context for comic effect the ideas of many men—the more incongruous the better?

Professor Ziegler's arguments are all interesting and suggestive, some of them convincing; but to secure the complete concurrence of scholarly opinion throughout the complexities of so involved a subject, calling often for conjectural explanation, would be well-nigh impossible. The use of fragmentary text material, over-ready assumption of the existence of real literary parallels, and the nice distinction between actual sources and the far less tangible ancestry of those ideas which filter down from age to age and finally become incorporated in literature—all these have their perils for the investigator. Professor Ziegler, I think, has for the most part avoided these pitfalls, and thus presents in this monograph a valuable study of an important question.

FRANK EGGLESTON ROBBINS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Aristotle on the Art of Poetry. An amplified version with supplementary illustrations for students of English. By LANE COOPER. New York: Ginn & Co., 1913. Pp. xxix+101. \$0.80.

Though the author, who is assistant professor of English in Cornell University, is hopeful that his work will not be without suggestiveness even to classical scholars, it is primarily intended for students of literature in

¹ It is to be noted that Professor Ziegler finds a reference to the division of the world-egg in the supposedly Orphic cosmogonic passages, Euripides *Melanippe* fr. 484 and Apoll. Rhod. I. 494 ff. This involves the assumption that the *μωρφή* referred to in each is that of an egg, corresponding to other Orphic sources. The usual view is that the word indicates something like the chaos of Hesiod *Theog.* 116 ff. (cf. Ovid *Met.* I. 6-7), and, as Miss Harrison remarks about the Hesiod passage (*Prolegomena*, 627), if the poet meant that the chaos was egg-shaped, he does not say so.

general and of English literature in particular. He thinks that these "gain less on a first acquaintance with the *Poetics* in any modern translation than their efforts commonly deserve." To this end he has first of all subdivided the translation into small sections and provided it with marginal glosses, often as many as four or five to a page. Secondly, he has expanded the text by frequent interpolations, printed in the same type as the translation itself. These insertions often occupy a page and in one instance three pages; all but the short ones are inclosed in brackets. They serve different purposes, sometimes merely marking a transition, amplifying an elliptical saying, or explaining an obscure point; sometimes emphasizing matters the importance of which might not be foreseen at a first reading or guarding against misconceptions; frequently suggesting that Aristotle's principles "have a wider application than his own illustrations, drawn solely from Greek literature, may serve to reveal." Such interpolated illustrations are taken chiefly from English literature and are supplied "in the spirit of the original." It may be stated at once that these devices and additions result in a book which cannot be otherwise than helpful to the readers for whom it was primarily written.

Professor Cooper lays no claim to independent authority as a Greek student but relies chiefly upon Bywater, "from whose conception of the text," he says, "I have but seldom intentionally departed." He acknowledges minor dependence upon Margoliouth, Butcher, and Tyrwhitt. In this I think he has not always been wise. Butcher's fourth edition, corrected in 1911, embodied that scholar's judgment upon Bywater's edition of 1909 and is not lightly to be set aside. In my opinion, Cooper incorrectly followed Bywater and rejected Butcher in explaining the two natural causes of poetry in 1448b4 and 20 (p. 10), in elucidating the phrase πολιτικῶς λέγοντας in 5067 (p. 26), and in punctuating and interpreting 60a35 (p. 83). But in such matters there is, of course, ample room for difference of opinion.

For classical scholars the book's value will consist principally in the modern parallels adduced, of which I cite some of the more apposite and important. Erasmus Darwin's versified botany is quoted as a parallel to Empedocles' metrical science (p. 4). Rembrandt's "Lesson in Anatomy" illustrates Aristotle's statement that we may admire in a painting what is repulsive in nature (p. 10). *Beowulf* and *Don Juan* exemplify the mistaken notion that a plot must needs have unity if it deals with one personage throughout (p. 30). Act IV of *The Merchant of Venice* shows a double reversal of action, since Portia's argument at first cheers Shylock and discourages Antonio but later has the opposite effect; and recognition and reversal are combined in Joseph and his brethren (p. 36). "Man's first disobedience" in *Paradise Lost*, the jealousy of Othello, Macbeth's ambition, and Lear's rashness are included under the ἀμαρτία from which tragic themes are produced (p. 41). Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor* displays the truly tragic ending, but *Ivanhoe* yields to the public's weakness for a happy dénouement

(p. 43). Aristotle criticizes most severely the situation which results when someone, though aware of the relationship, seems about to do his kinsman a deadly injury and refrains; such a situation occurs in *Hamlet*, III, iii (p. 47). Baseness beyond what is necessary for the plot is seen in the Edmund and Regan of *King Lear*; inappropriateness to the manly type in the title rôle of *King Richard II*, and to the womanly in the clever speech of Portia at the trial in *The Merchant of Venice*; and inconsistency in the Oliver at the beginning and end of *As You Like It* (p. 50). Both external tokens and reasoning are used to bring about a recognition in *The Winter's Tale* (pp. 53 and 57), and a display of feelings caused by memory is employed for the same purpose in *Paradise Lost*, IV (p. 55). Failure to visualize the action accounts for certain inconsistencies in *King Lear* (p. 58). Shakespeare is a poet of the plastic sort, Marlowe one with the touch of madness (p. 59). The meaning of what Aristotle called the intellectual element is clearly elucidated from Claudius, Iago, and Hamlet (pp. 64 f.). Satan's speeches in *Paradise Lost* illustrate the difference between the morally good and the artistically good in literature (p. 88). How far these parallels are new needs no detailed consideration here. I judge that Professor Cooper himself would not claim originality for all of them. Certainly few of them lie beyond the ken of the ordinary classical scholar. It might be expected that a specialist in another department would be able to enlighten us more. But perhaps Hiltz's dictum holds true here: "Truth, wherever it may be sought, is, as a rule, so simple that it does not look learned enough."

ROY C. FLICKINGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Dioniso: Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane.

By A. CARLO PASCAL. Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1911.

Pp. xv+259. L. 5.

This book is a series of graceful essays, conceived in a popular manner, though fortified with a considerable apparatus of footnotes, about one-third of which is devoted to Dionysus and the Mysteries in partial justification of the main title. The author has a contagious admiration for Aristophanes, and enlivens his pages with an occasional exclamation of pleasure and approval.

Pascal's general conclusions are substantially sound. He expresses them thus: "That the elements of the comic representation of different divine personages were already contained in embryo in literary and popular tradition, and markedly so in tragedy" (referring here especially to the satyr plays; cf. pp. 57 ff.); ". . . that Aristophanes, like so many others of the ancients, has a purely political conception of religion," whence, given his passionate local patriotism, it follows that "the satire of the poet is implacable